## **HIGHER EDUCATION/Academic Major Requirement for Teachers**

SUBJECT: Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998 . . . S. 1882. Bingaman/Cochran amendment No. 3116

**ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 23-74** 

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1882, the Higher Education Act of 1998, will reauthorize and amend numerous Federal higher education programs.

The Bingaman/Cochran amendment would require States and higher education institutions to require each undergraduate student preparing to be a secondary school teacher to complete an academic major in the subject he or she intended to teach, as defined by the institution which he or she attended. Most Federal higher education aid would be denied to States and higher education institutions that failed to adopt this requirement within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act. Federal grants and loans to students would not be affected by this requirement.

## **Those favoring** the amendment contended:

Secondary school teachers cannot effectively teach subjects that they themselves do not understand. Taking extensive classes in education just is not enough to prepare one to explain nuclear particle physics, differential calculus, or the intricacies of constitutional law. According to a recently completed analysis of State level student achievement data, students who have teachers with both teaching certificates and academic degrees do significantly better in school than other students. The findings are consistent, regardless of income or ethnicity and regardless of whether English is the first or second language of the students. Further, secondary school teachers who are assigned subjects to teach that they themselves have not been taught become discouraged and quit teaching at a much higher rate than other teachers. Only 28 out of 100 new teachers who do not have academic majors last more than 3 years as teachers; in contrast, 75 out of 100 new teachers who have academic majors last more than 3 years. Thirty States have a requirement that students receiving a postsecondary education teaching degree must also complete an academic major,

<b>YEAS</b> (23)		NAYS (74)			NOT VOTING (3)	
Republicans (3 or 6%)	Democrats (20 or 45%)	Republicans		Democrats	Republicans	Democrats
		(50	or 94%)	(24 or 55%)	(2)	(1)
Cochran Domenici Lugar	Biden Bingaman Boxer Bryan Bumpers Conrad Daschle Dorgan Durbin Ford Harkin Hollings Johnson Kerrey Moseley-Braun Reed Reid Robb Torricelli Wellstone	Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brownback Burns Campbell Chafee Coats Collins Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Enzi Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Grams Grassley Gregg Hagel Hatch	Helms Hutchinson Inhofe Jeffords Kempthorne Lott Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob Smith, Gordon Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Akaka Baucus Breaux Byrd Cleland Dodd Feingold Feinstein Glenn Graham Inouye Kennedy Kerry Kohl Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Murray Rockefeller Sarbanes Wyden	1—Offic 2—Nece 3—Illnes 4—Other SYMBO AY—An	LS: nounced Yea nounced Nay red Yea

VOTE NO. 193 JULY 9, 1998

and 2 States have comparable requirements. The other 18 States do not have any such requirements. Each year the Federal Government spends \$1.8 billion to support education training programs, including programs in those 18 States. Considering the amount of money being spent, we do not think that it is too much to ask that at a minimum the States require secondary education training programs to have an academic major requirement. The Bingaman/Cochran amendment would just make the minimal, commonsense demand that postsecondary school teachers should receive training in the subjects they expect to teach. It would be totally up to the States and the schools to design the courses. For \$1.8 billion in aid each year, it is not too much to ask of these 18 States.

## **Those opposing** the amendment contended:

Our colleagues are correct that prospective secondary school teachers should complete an academic major, but the Federal Government should not threaten to withhold aid from States that do not impose such a requirement. The much better approach, which is followed by this bill, is to encourage those 18 States that have not yet moved in this direction to do so by offering them financial incentives. Additionally, we are concerned that the Bingaman/Cochran amendment could hurt our States even though they already have the types of laws that are sought by the amendment. Our colleagues do not believe that our States would be affected, but we are not so sure. For example, Connecticut's law applies only to certain subjects. Language teachers are exempt from the requirement, because in the judgment of that State it is not necessary for that subject area. We do not think that we should necessarily second-guess Connecticut, which has teachers who are consistently rated among the best in the country. Again, the purpose of this amendment is laudable--it is just that we cannot support its punitive approach. Therefore, we urge its rejection.